REMARKS

This paper is being provided in response to the October 15, 2002 Office Action for the above-referenced application. In this response, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 50, 67, 87, 92, and 93 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant deems to be the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the modifications to the Claims are supported by the originally-filed application.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15-19 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stiegemeier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,381, hereinafter referred to as "Stiegemeier") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15-19 and 25-27, as amended herein, are patentable over the reference.

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, recites a computer implemented method. Data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented is received. The visual form of data is analyzed and at least some of the content data is identified in accordance with a template. The content data and the format data are different from the template data. The identified content data is stored. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 15 and 16 depend from Claim 1.

Applicant's Claim 17, as amended herein, recites computer readable media containing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing the visual form of data and identifying at least some of the

content data in accordance with a template, wherein the content data and the format are different from the template; and storing the identified content data.

Applicant's Claim 18, as amended herein, recites a computer system. An input port receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented. A processor analyzes the visual form of data and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a template. The content data and the format data are different from the template. A storage media stores the identified content data.

Applicant's Claim 19, as amended herein, recites a method comprising: transmitting data representing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing the visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and storing the identified content data.

Applicant's Claim 25, as amended herein, recites a computer implemented method. Data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented is received. The visual form of data is analyzed and identifying at least some of the content data is identified in accordance with a template. The content data and the format data are different from the template. Performance of an action is initiated based on results of the identifying of at least some of the content data.

Applicant's Claim 26, as amended herein, recites computer readable media containing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and initiating performance of an action based on results of said identifying of at least some of the content data.

Applicant's Claim 27, as amended herein, recites a computer system. An input port receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented. A processor analyzes the visual form of data and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a template and initiates performance of an action based on results of the identification of at least some of the content data. The content data and the format data are different from the template.

Stiegemeier discloses a data management system user interface that allows users to enter, store, retrieve, and display multiple, related groups of information in a single document. The interface loads document data into a separate template which defines various fields, and the interface determines that should be displayed based on the information entered by the user. The interface also contains data validation and error correction feature that provides automatic correction, prompts for manual correction and allows the user to save a document with a list of errors for future correction at a later date. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Lines 11-17). The system

retrieves a document that may optionally include a code identifying a template that provides the format for displaying the data. If the template resides in memory, or if the template is loaded into active memory, the system may access the document, extract the data from the document, format the data in accordance with the template instructions and the client script program, and display the data in the format as instructed by the template. (Col. 10, Lines 31-57; Figures 3 and 4).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Stiegemeier discloses formatting data as instructed by a template and script and then displaying the data in the format as instructed by the template. Stiegemeier does not analyze the visual form of data. Stiegemeier does not disclose content data and format data that represent the visual form of data in which the content data and format data are different from the template. In contrast, Stiegemeier discloses using a template that includes the format data. Accordingly, the reference neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***a computer implemented method comprising: analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Stiegemeier appears to teach away from Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's claimed invention uses a template in analyzing the visual form of data. In contrast, Stiegemeier is constructing or creating a visual form of data using data and a template indicating how the data is to be displayed. Additionally, an embodiment of Applicant's claimed invention may use the resulting display of Stiegemeier as an input which is then analyzed, as in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Stiegemeier teaches using a template to display the data rather than using a template to analyze the visual form of data.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 1, Applicant's amended Claim 17 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. In particular, Applicant's amended Claim 17 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests ***computer readable media containing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format are different from said template; and storing the identified content data***, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 17.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 1, Applicant's amended Claim 18 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. In particular, Applicant's amended Claim 17 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests a ***computer system comprising: a input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; a processor that analyzes said***

visual form of data and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and a storage media that stores the identified content data, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 18.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 1, Applicant's amended Claim 19 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. In particular, Applicant's amended Claim 19 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests ***a method comprising: transmitting data representing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 19.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 1, Applicant's amended Claim 25 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. In particular, Applicant's amended Claim 25 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and initiating***

performance of an action based on results of said identifying of at least some of the content data, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 25.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 1, Applicant's amended Claim 26 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. In particular, Applicant's amended Claim 26 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests ***computer readable media containing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and initiating performance of an action based on results of said identifying of at least some of the content data,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 26.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 1, Applicant's amended Claim 27 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. In particular, Applicant's amended Claim 27 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests a ***computer system comprising: an input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and a processor that analyzes said visual form of data and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a template and initiates performance of an action based on results of said identification of at least some of the content data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 27.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 4-6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Graefe et al. (USP 6,298,342, hereinafter referred to as "Graefe")is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 4-6, and 10 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 4-6 and 10 depend from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Stiegemeier. Applicant respectfully submits, for reasons set forth below, that combining Stiegemeier with Graefe also neither discloses nor suggests Applicant's Claim 1, or claims that depend therefrom.

Graefe relates to electronic data processing, and more specifically concerns new query operations for the manipulation of tables in relational databases and similar types of data-management software. (Col. 1, Lines 7-10). Graefe discloses a "pivot" operation that rotates data items in a relational database table so that certain data values in the table become column names of the pivoted table, and the data items of a specified value column appear in corresponding rows in the new columns of the pivoted table. (See Abstract; Col. 3, Lines 7-20).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data***

comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. As set forth above, Stiegemeier does not analyze the visual form of data. Stiegemeier does not disclose content data and format data that represent the visual form of data in which the content data and format data are different from the template. In contrast, Stiegemeier discloses using a template that includes the format data. Accordingly, Stiegemeier neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Graefe discloses rotating items in a relational database table and appears silent on any disclosure of analyzing a visual form of data. Thus, Graefe does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Geaghan (US Patent No. 5,790,114, hereinafter referred to as "Geaghan") is hereby

traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 8 depends from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Applicant's Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Stiegemeier. Applicant respectfully submits that combining Stiegemeier with Geaghan also neither discloses nor suggests Claim 1, for reasons set forth below.

Geaghan discloses an electronic whiteboard coupled to a computer which receives information from the whiteboard indicative of a graphical user inputs entered via a writing region of the whiteboard and control inputs entered via a control region of the whiteboard. A driver executing on the whiteboard receives the information transmitted by the whiteboard, performs certain actions on the received data, and causes an application program to retrieve the information and store the information to a session file. The application provides a user interface which allows a user to view images generated on the whiteboard, store such images, and view previously stored images. The images may also be manipulated in a variety of ways. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Line 52-Col. 2, Line 5).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format***

data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. As set forth above, Stiegemeier does not analyze the visual form of data. Stiegemeier does not disclose content data and format data that represent the visual form of data in which the content data and format data are different from the template. In contrast, Stiegemeier discloses using a template that includes the format data. Accordingly, Stiegemeier neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template*** ,as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Geaghan discloses providing a user interface allowing users to view images and manipulate images. However, Geaghan appears silent on any disclosure about analyzing a visual form of data. Additionally, Geaghan neither discloses nor suggests a visual form of data including content data and format data different from a template used in analyzing the visual form. Thus, Geaghan does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Graefe and Ishikawa (USP 5,933,527, hereinafter referred to as "Ishikawa") is hereby

traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claim 11 is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 11 depends from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Stiegemeier and Graefe. For reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that combining Stiegemeier and Graefe with Ishikawa also neither discloses nor suggests Applicant's Claim 1

Ishikawa relates to facial image processing techniques, and more specifically, an improved facial processing method and apparatus for generating feature coordinate information corresponding to characteristic parts of a facial image useful in facial morphing, identification and blending operations. (Col. 1, Lines 6-11). Ishikawa discloses extracting specific feature areas of a facial image and outputting accurate coordinate data for the extracted facial features. (See Abstract).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. As set forth above, Stiegemeier and Graefe do not disclose or suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the***

content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Ishikawa appears silent regarding analyzing visual form of data including content data and format data. Further, Ishikawa appears silent regarding disclosing a template used in analyzing the data that is different from the format data and content data. Thus, Ishikawa does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier and Graefe with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier and further in view of Maejima et al. (USP 5,327,568, hereinafter referred to as "Maejima") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 12-14 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 12-14 depend from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Applicant's Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Stiegemeier. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining Stiegemeier with Maejima also neither discloses nor suggests Claim 1, or claims that depend therefrom.

Maejima discloses an apparatus for supporting development of a graphic data drive program including a data driven mechanism enabling instructions of the data driven program to be executed whenever all input data necessary for executing the instructions is available. (See Abstract). Maejima discloses producing and executing an instruction template and displaying the execution process of the instruction on the screen of a terminal. (Col. 5, Lines 37-42).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Stiegemeier neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template*** ,as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Maejima discloses producing and executing an instruction template and displaying the execution process of the instruction on the screen of a terminal, but appears silent on analyzing the visual form of data. Further, Maejima's template is a code template including instructions that are machine language instructions whose execution is displayed on a screen. Maejima's template is not used in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Maejima does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and***

identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 50, 52-54, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 87-89, 92 and 93 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 50, 52-54, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 87-89, 92 and 93, as amended herein, are patentable over the reference.

Claim 50, as amended herein, recites a method executed in a computer system for processing data. Data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented is received. The visual form of data is analyzed. At least some of the content data is identified in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction. The content data and said format data are different from the template. The identified content data is stored as at least one tag value. Claims 52-54 depend from Claim 50.

Claim 67, as amended herein, recites a method executed in a computer system for processing data. The data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented is received. A template is applied to the visual form of data. The visual form of data is analyzed. A portion of

the content data is identified in accordance with the. The template includes extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data. The content data and the format data are different from the template. A tag value for at least one tag identified in the template is extracted. Claims 68, 70, and 72-74 depend from Claim 67.

Claim 87, as amended herein, recites a system for processing data. A data receiver receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually displayed. A template runner applies a template to the data and analyzes the visual form of data and identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value. The content data and the format data are different from the template. The template is stored in a database. Claims 88 and 89 depend from Claim 87.

Claim 92, as amended herein, recites a computer program product used to process data. Machine executable code receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented. Machine executable code analyzes the visual form of data and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template. Machine executable code stores the identified content data as at least one tag value.

Claim 93, as amended herein, recites a computer program product used to process data in a computer system. Machine executable code receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be

visually represented. Machine executable code applies a template to the visual form of data. Machine executable code analyzes the visual form of data and identifies a portion of the content data in accordance with the template. The template includes extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template. Machine executable code extracts a tag value for at least one tag identified in the template.

DuFresne discloses deploying applications based on the HTTP protocol. (See Abstract; Col. 2, Line 58-Col. 3, Line 3). Executable tags (tag extensions) are inserted in an HTML source. The extensions are processed and replaced with values such that only HTML tags remain with static values as arguments. (Col. 3, Lines 4-55). A template is an HTML form to define contents of a display Web page requested by a client. The template includes HTML tags and tag extensions to define and build a web page. (Col. 8, Lines 59-67).

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference in that the reference neither discloses nor suggests ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50. DuFresne discloses using a template including HTML tags embedded with text which, when processed, produces a displayed Web page. DuFresne does not analyze a visual form of data. Rather,

DuFresne produces a display page and processes the HTML tag extensions included in a template. DuFresne discloses a template that includes HTML tags embedded with text that is displayed rather than a visual form of data including content data and format data different from the template. Accordingly, the reference neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50.

DuFresne appears to teach away from Applicant's claimed invention in that DuFresne produces an HTML page which, when further processed, is displayed in a format as set forth in the HTML page. This is in contrast to an embodiment of Applicant's claimed invention which may take as an input a displayed HTML page in which the HTML page is produced by DuFresne's system. Additionally, DuFresne teaches away from a system using content data and format data representing the visual form of data that is different from the template since DuFresne's HTML file includes commands and content data within the template.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. In particular, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne in that DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template***

including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 67.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 87 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. In particular, Applicant's Claim 87, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne in that DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests ***a system for processing data comprising: a data receiver that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually displayed; a template runner that applies a template to said data and analyzes said visual form of data and identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and a database in which said template is stored,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 87.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 92 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. In particular, Applicant's Claim 92, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne in that DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests ***a computer program product used to process data comprising: machine executable code that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; machine executable code that analyzes said visual form of data and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said***

content data and said format data are different from said template; and machine executable code that stores the identified content data as at least one tag value, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 92.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 93 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. In particular, Applicant's Claim 93, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne in that DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests ***a computer program product used to process data in a computer system comprising: machine executable code that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; machine executable code that applies a template to the visual form of data; machine executable code that analyzes said visual form of data and identifies a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and machine executable code that extracts a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 93.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 51, 71, 90 and 91 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Graefe and Ishikawa is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is

respectfully requested. Claims 51, 71, 90 and 91 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 51 depends from independent Claim 50. Claim 71 depends from independent Claim 67. Claims 90 and 91 depend from independent Claim 87. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Claims 50, 67 and 87 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne with Graefe and Ishikawa also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50, 67, and 87.

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. As discussed elsewhere herein, Graefe discloses rotating items in a relational database table and appears silent on any disclosure of analyzing a visual form of data. As also discussed elsewhere herein, Ishikawa appears silent regarding analyzing a visual form of data including

content data and format data. Further, Ishikawa appears silent regarding disclosing a template used in analyzing the data that is different from the format data and content data. Thus, Graefe and Ishikawa do not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFrense with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references. In particular, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 87 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references. In particular, Applicant's Claim 87, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in

combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a system for processing data comprising: a data receiver that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually displayed; a template runner that applies a template to said data and analyzes said visual form of data and identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and a database in which said template is stored***, as set forth in amended Claim 87.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 55-58 and 75-78 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Maejima is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 55-58 and 75-78 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 55-58 depend from independent Claim 50. Claims 75-78 depend from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Applicant's Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. For reasons set forth below, Applicant further submits that combining DuFresne with Maejima also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50 and 67.

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest

a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. As discussed elsewhere herein, Maejima discloses producing and executing an instruction template and displaying the execution process of the instruction on the screen of a terminal, but appears silent on analyzing the visual form of data. Further, Maejima's template is a code template including instructions that are machine language instructions whose execution is displayed on a screen. Maejima's template is not used in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Maejima does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references. In particular, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in

combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 59-62 and 79-82 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Graefe is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 59-62 and 79-82 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 59-62 depend from independent Claim 50. Claims 79-82 depend from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Applicant's Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DeFresne with Graefe also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50 and 67.

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. As discussed elsewhere herein, Graefe discloses rotating items in a relational database table and appears silent on any disclosure of analyzing a visual form of data. Thus, Graefe does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references. In particular, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a***

computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template, as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 63, 64, 66, 83, 84 and 86 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Ferrel et al. (USP 6,230,173, hereinafter referred to as "Ferrel") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 63, 64, 66, 83, 84 and 86 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 63, 64, and 66 depend from Claim 50. Claims 83, 84 and 86 depend from Claim 67. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne with Ferrel also neither discloses nor suggests Applicant's Claims 50 and 67.

Ferrel relates to electronic publishing systems and, more specifically, to an authoring system for creating structured documents in an on-line publishing system. (Col. 1, Lines 7-10).

Ferrel's system includes a story editor that can save files in a multimedia document format. (See Abstract; Col. 3, Lines 39-45). Ferrel discloses publishing structured documents in an electronic publication system including inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with a tag, inserting an embedded object into the story object, storing the tagged text portions in a first object storage of the story object, storing the embedded object into a second object storage of the story object, and displaying selected ones of the text portions and the embedded object, the selection dependent upon the tags. (Col. 4, Lines 9-19).

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. Ferrel appears silent regarding analyzing a visual form of data. Ferrel also appears silent on disclosing a template used in analyzing the visual form of data in which the template is different from the content data and format data. Thus, Ferrel does not overcome the foregoing

deficiencies of DuFresne with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references. In particular, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 65 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Ferrel and Petty et al. (USP 6,342,907, hereinafter referred to as "Petty") is

hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 65 and 85 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 65 depend from independent Claim 50. Claim 85 depends from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne and Ferrel. For reasons set forth below, Applicant further submits that combining DuFresne and Ferrel with Petty also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50 and 67.

Petty discloses a specification language that allows a user to define platform independent user interface panels without detailed knowledge of complex computer programming languages. The specification language is referred to as a Panel Definition Markup Language (PDML) that defines tags used similar to those in HTML. A graphical editor allows the creation and modification of platform-independent user interface panels. Petty also discloses a converter tool that may be used to convert platform-specific user interface panels to corresponding platform independent user interface panels. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Lines 12-15).

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in

Applicant's amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne and Ferrel do not discloses no suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. Petty appears silent regarding any disclosure of analyzing the visual form of data and also appears silent regarding content data and format data different from the template used in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Petty does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne and Ferrel with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references. In particular, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different***

from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template, as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 69 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Sparks (USP 6,167,382, hereinafter referred to as "Sparks") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claim 69 is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 69 depend from Claim 67. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Claim 67 is neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne. For reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that combining DuFresne with Sparks also neither discloses nor suggests Claim 67.

Sparks pertains generally to the field of print advertising and commercial display signage and their design and production, and more specifically to an integrated system using an Internet site and networked computer systems for the storage of pre-designed formats and images, the assembly of them into electronic files ready for production, and the ordering of all design, assembly, production, and distribution from a single entry point in the system. (Col. 1, Lines 8-16). A client at a remote site may order each of a series of images for a low resolution image database and may then assemble these images and text into a marketing piece. The client may assemble the marketing pieces according to one of a series of predefined templates. (See Abstract).

Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, ... wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67. Sparks appears silent regarding analyzing a visual form of data. Further, Sparks discloses using a template to assemble a marketing piece from a series of images, but appears silent on disclosing a template used in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Sparks does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 67. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a template having an extraction instruction, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections and objections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 617-248-4042.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART

Date: April 2, 2003

Anne E. Saturnelli
Registration No. 41,290

Patent Group
Choate, Hall & Stewart
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-2804